From: **Cynthia Caporale/ESC/R3/USEPA/US**
Sent: 4/3/2012 10:54:49 PM

To: Ed Messer/ESC/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
CC: Fred Foreman/ESC/R3/USEPA/US@EPA; Mike Mahoney/ESC/R3/USEPA/US@EPA; Robin Costas/ESC/R3/USEPA/US@EPA; John Curry/ESC/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject: Fw: EXTERNAL: Re: Verification/Completeness Check for Dimock (R3 WO 1202005 PART 1 Posted Mar 15)

I'm not sure I totally agree with the rationale below but there might be a point when it comes to TDS. Does this also apply to metals (we gave this suggestion to Cu result too)? These field blanks were a problem across the board so not sure what to think about the statement below.

One other consideration I can think of is the fact that each home is a unique sampling event (field blanks - I thought were prepared at each home but maybe that's not the case). There are two sampling teams, hence allowing for possible inconsistencies between field blanks.

Any thoughts?

Cynthia Caporale, Chief
OASQA Laboratory Branch
U.S. EPA Region III
Environmental Science Center
Fort Meade, MD
(410) 305-2732
Fax: (410) 305-3095
----- Forwarded by Cynthia Caporale/ESC/R3/USEPA/US on 04/03/2012 10:50 PM -----

From: **Ex. 4 - CBI** @lmco.com>
To: Cynthia Caporale/ESC/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 04/03/2012 05:30 PM
Subject: RE: EXTERNAL: Re: Verification/Completeness Check for Dimock (R3 WO 1202005 PART 1 Posted Mar 15)

Cindy,

Just so you know where my concerns are..... I believe the reason why the NFG does not address field blanks is because it becomes either a laboratory, bottle or DI water contamination issue. With organic compounds that are volatile, they can diffuse through the Teflon-lined septa or a loosely tightened bottle cross-contaminating the sample. With an inorganic parameter such as TDS unless the bottle is broken where it may be feasible for contamination to occur, contamination would be attributed to the bottles themselves, the DI water or the laboratory (not cleaning the evaporating dishes or filtration device properly).

If someone is savvy, they may question the source and storage of the DI water, how many samples were collected in the lot of bottles used, and if collected in the same lot of bottles, why aren't the data consistent from FB to FB.

With that said, should we go back and change the RL to 13 mg/L based on FB06 to be consistent (see the Dimock_16 report)? Currently the samples have a 12 mg/L RL based on the MB result (last time this came up).

Let me know.

Ex. 4 - CBI
From: **Ex. 4 - CBI**
Sent: Tuesday, April 03, 2012 4:46 PM
To: 'Cynthia Caporale'
Cc: **Ex. 4 - CBI** Gary Newhart; John Gilbert; Kelley Chase; **Ex. 4 - CBI** Ed Messer; Fred Foreman; Robin Costas; Stevie Wilding

Subject: RE: EXTERNAL: Re: Verification/Completeness Check for Dimock (R3 WO 1202005 PART 1 Posted Mar 15)

Cindy,

If that is the practice used by R3 to validate data, I will direct the SERAS staff on-site to elevate the RL to the level found in the field blank. Since R3 practice is to elevate all samples in the batch to the highest level found in the blanks, I am assuming that the RL for all samples (total and filtered) in Batches BB21502, BB21505 and BB22103 will be 7.4 ug/L based on FB18 collected on 2/15/12. Anything over that is not qualified. Please confirm.

Ex. 4 - CBI

From: Cynthia Caporale [mailto:Caporale.Cynthia@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, April 03, 2012 3:27 PM
To: Ex. 4 - CBI
Cc: Ex. 4 - CBI Gary Newhart; John Gilbert; Kelley Chase; Ex. 4 - CBI Ed Messer; Fred Foreman; Robin Costas; Stevie Wilding
Subject: EXTERNAL: Re: Verification/Completeness Check for Dimock (R3 WO 1202005 PART 1 Posted Mar 15)

Ex. 4 - CBI and Kelley,

The report on the Dimock Verification/Completeness Check for file 1202005 FINAL Part 1 of 3 R33907 03 15 12 1429.pdf was reviewed and below are the responses for your consideration.

Please note that we (including QA Staff responsible for R3 Data Validation) disagree with the approach taken for Item #1. A response is provided and if further discussion is needed please let me know and we'll arrange a conference call.

File 1202005 FINAL PART 1 of 3 R33907 03 15 12 1429.pdf

1. Copper was found above the RL in FB18 collected on 2/15/12. FB16 collected on 2/13/12 and FB17 collected on 2/14/12 did not contain copper above the RL. Results for copper for sample HW07 should be qualified estimated "J". The remaining samples in batches BB21502 (HW27z-F, HW27-F, Hw27z and HW27) and BB21505 (HW59, HW11-P, HW53, HW53-P, HW57-P, HW59-F, HW11-PF, HW53-F, HW53-PF, HW57-PF and HW57) should not be qualified in the result column in Scribe even though "B" flags were assigned by the laboratory.

Response: **Region 3 Data Validation Procedures include criteria for qualifying samples based on field blanks. According to Region 3 procedures results that are 5x or 10x below the amount found in a field or method blank are qualified "B." Since the "B" qualifier is not being used for this project, we highly recommend the quantitation limit be raised and qualified as "U." Retaining the value and qualifying "J" is not recommended for the data use involved with the project as it tends to cause confusion as to the presence of a compound or constituent when really the value was due to blank contamination.**

2. The RPD for arsenic for sample HW27 (lab #1202005-08) exceeded the RPD criterion. Since the source result and the duplicate are within five times the RL and it is not possible to ascertain if the remaining samples in the batch are sufficiently similar, this reviewer agrees with the "J" qualifier applied to sample HW27 only. The "J" flag should be carried over into the Scribe result qualifier column.

Response: **We Agree.**

3. The MS recovery for sample HW53 (lab #1202005-14) exceeded the 70-130% criterion. Since it is not possible to ascertain if the remaining samples in the batch are sufficiently similar, this reviewer agrees with the "J" qualifier applied to sample HW53 only. The "J" flag should be carried over into the Scribe result qualifier column.

Response: **We Agree.**

4. The LCS recovery for tin for Batch BB22103 exceeded the 85-115% criterion. No additional qualifications are required since the samples were non-detect for tin in this batch.

Response: **We Agree.**

5. The RPD for nickel for sample HW03 (lab #1202005-34) exceeded the RPD criterion. Since the source result and the duplicate are within five times the RL and it is not possible to ascertain if the remaining samples in the batch are sufficiently similar, this reviewer agrees with the "J" qualifier applied to sample HW03 only. The "J" flag should be carried over into the Scribe result qualifier column.

Response: **We Agree.**

6. There were several metals that exceeded the secondary MCLs: Aluminum for HW57-PF; iron for HW57, HW03 and HW03z; and manganese for HW53, HW57, HW03, HW03-F, HW03z, HW03z-F and HW07

Response: **No comment.**

Cynthia Caporale, Chief
OASQA Laboratory Branch
U.S. EPA Region III
Environmental Science Center
Fort Meade, MD
(410) 305-2732
Fax: (410) 305-3095

From: Ex. 4 - CBI lmco.com>
To: Cynthia Caporale/ESC/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Kelley Chase/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: John Gilbert/CI/USEPA/US@EPA, Gary Newhart/CI/USEPA/US@EPA, Ex. 4 - CBI @lmco.com>, Ex. 4 - CBI
Ex. 4 - CBI @lmco.com>
Date: 03/21/2012 11:29 AM
Subject: Verification/Completeness Check for Dimock (R3 WO 1202005 PART 1 Posted Mar 15)

.....is attached for your review and consideration.

Ex. 4 - CBI

Lockheed Martin
Scientific, Engineering, Response and Analytical Services (SERAS)

Ex. 4 - CBI

[attachment "SERAS-172-DSR-032112_32.docx" deleted by Cynthia Caporale/ESC/R3/USEPA/US]